REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-16, 19-28, and 30-32 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended as shown on pages 2-6 of the Reply. The below comments present in greater detail distinctive features of applicants' claimed invention over the cited art that were conveyed to the Examiner over the telephone on November 17, 2008.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Rejection of Claims 1 and 3-15 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

Claims 1 and 3-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1 and 11 have been amended herein, and in view of this, the rejection is now moot and should be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 16, 20, and 26 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 3-4, 6, 16, 20, and 26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meik *et al.* (US 2005/0108200 A1) in view of Do *et al.* (US 2002/0170042 A1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Meik *et al.* and Do *et al.*, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all features recited by the subject claims.

The claimed invention relates to a distributed object classification systems and provides a method for unrelated tools to categorize elements they control according to a common, centrally managed classification scheme. To this end, independent claim 1 recites *a computer readable distributed classification system having computer executable components, comprising* ***a plurality of software components shared by unrelated software design tools,*** *stored in a computer readable medium, wherein* ***each of the design tools controls at least one of the software components*** *and a classification component that couples the software components to* ***a common classification structure based on a structure type and comprising structure type class, node types and structural constraints, the structural constraints define the permissible parent-child relationship between the various node types,*** *wherein a plurality of applications access the*

software components Independent claim 16 recites similar features. Meik *et al.* fails to teach or suggest such novel features recited by the subject claims.

Meik *et al.* relates to search engines applied to the Internet or corporate intranet domains for retrieving accessible documents using automatic text categorization techniques, to support the presentation of search query results within high-speed network environments. At the cited portions, Meik *et al.* discloses corporate network domains that comprise documents in various formats and stored across various servers, and a system that filters the documents, performs content-related analysis and stored the documents in a knowledge database. Further, Meik *et al.* discloses automatic text classification of text documents into a set of categories or index terms, applying inductive learning techniques for automatically creating classifiers which use labeled training data and a search engine that performs document categorization. Nowhere does Meik *et al.* disclose *a classification component that couples the software components to* ***a common classification structure based on a structure type and comprising structure type class, node types and structural constraints, the structural constraints define the permissible parent-child relationship between the various node types.*** Rather, each one of the documents is categorized based on an automatic text categorization method that applies a decision tree classification to the features of words and/or word combinations identified in the document, to *classify the features in the document* based on a tree structure. In contrast, the claimed invention provides for *classifying the software components* based on a structure type that comprises structure type class, node types and structural constraints, the structural constraints define the permissible parent-child relationship between the various node types of the classification structure. Thus, Meik *et al.* is silent regarding the aforementioned features recited by independent claim 1.

At page 4 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner concedes that Meik *et al.* is silent regarding each of the design tools controlling at least one of the classified software components.

Do *et al.* relates to a system of designing and producing software code. At the cited portions, Do *et al.* discloses a reverse-engineering system that inputs a previously-developed software code comprising a plurality of instructions, determines the objects in the code and a relationship between the objects, and generates a design model. An axiomatic design tool provides the design model that can be utilized to test and extend the software code so that it can be reused in other applications. By populating an axiomatic design equation, the software developer is able to identify objects within the software code and determine the coupling

between the objects. Nowhere does Do *et al.* disclose ***a plurality of software components shared by unrelated software design tools,*** *stored in a computer readable medium, wherein* ***each of the design tools controls at least one of the software components.*** Rather, the design tool can be utilized to identify objects in the software code, identify couplings between objects and generate a design equation. Hence, while the claimed invention relates to generating a classification scheme that involving unrelated design tools to categorize *the software components they control* Do *et al.* teaches identifying existing relationships/hierarchies existing between objects/classes.

By allowing unrelated software design tools to classify the elements they control according to a centrally managed classification system defining a structure type comprising structure type class, node types and structural constraints, and storing them in an organized hierarchy, the system allows different applications to access elements stored in the organized hierarchy.

In view of at least the foregoing it is readily apparent that Meik *et al.* and Do *et al.*, alone or in combination, do not disclose or suggest all features recited by applicants' subject claims. Accordingly it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

III. Rejection of Claims 7, 9-12, 14-15, 21, 23-25, 27, and 30-32 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7, 9-12, 14-15, 21, 23-25, 27, and 30-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meik *et al.* (US 2005/0108200 A1) in view of Gargi *et al.* (US 2005/0027712 A1) further in view of Do *et al.* (US 2002/0170042 A1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. The cited references, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all aspects set forth in the subject claims.

The claimed invention relates to a distributed object classification systems and provides a method for unrelated tools to categorize elements they control according to a common, centrally managed classification scheme. To this end, independent claim 1 recites a distributed classification system comprising ***a plurality of software components shared by unrelated software design tools,*** *stored in a computer readable medium, wherein* ***each of the design tools controls at least one of the software components.*** Independent claims 11 and 28 recite similar features. Meik *et al.*, Gargi *et al.* and Do *et al.* fail to disclose such novel features recited by the subject claims.

Meik *et al.* relates to search engines applied to the Internet or corporate intranet domains for retrieving accessible documents using automatic text categorization techniques, to support the presentation of search query results within high-speed network environments. As discussed *supra* with respect to independent claim 1, Meik *et al.* is silent regarding the aforementioned features recited by the subject claims.

Do *et al.* relates to a system of designing and producing software code. However, as discussed *supra* with respect to independent claim 1, Do *et al.* is silent regarding *wherein* ***each of the design tools controls at least one of the software components*** as recited by independent claim 1.

Gargi *et al.* relates to systems and methods for organizing a collection of objects. At the cited portions, Gargi *et al.* teaches an object manager that arranges objects into a sequence that is ordered in accordance with context related metadata associated with the object and automatically segments them into clusters. The context related metadata is then accessed to extract names for the clusters, and the objects are then arranged in a hierarchical structure. The objects classified by the system disclosed by Gargi *et al.*, are media objects or business process entities. However, Gargi *et al.* is silent regarding the objects being shared by the unrelated processes, or the objects being controlled by the unrelated design tools. Thus, Gargi *et al.* is silent regarding ***a plurality of software components shared by unrelated software design tools,*** *stored in a computer readable medium, wherein* ***each of the design tools controls at least one of the software components*** as recited by independent claim 1.

In view of at least the foregoing it is readily apparent that Meik *et al.*, Gargi *et al.* and Do *et al.*, either alone or in combination do not teach or suggest each and every element set forth in the applicants' subject claims. Accordingly it is requested that this rejection should be withdrawn.

IV. Rejection of Claims 5, 8, 13, 19, and 22 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 5, 8, 13, 19, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meik *et al.* (US 2005/0108200 A1) in view of Gargi *et al.* (US 2005/0027712 A1) further in view of Omoigui *et al.* (US 2003/0126136 A1). It is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Meik, *et al.*, Gargi *et al.* and Omoigui *et al.*, alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest all aspects set forth in the subject claims.

Claims 5, 8, 13, 19 and 22 depend from independent claims 1, 11, and 16 respectively. As discussed *supra*, Meik, *et al.* and Gargi *et al.* do not disclose all the features of independent claims 1, 11 and 16. Omoigui *et al.* relates to knowledge retrieval, management and presentation of domain specific semantic information and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Meik, *et al.* and Gargi *et al.* with respect to the independent claims. Thus, applicants' invention as recited in the subject claims is not obvious over the combination of Meik, *et al.*, Gargi *et al.* and Omoigui *et al.* Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP636US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

/Himanshu S. Amin/
Himanshu S. Amin
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
57TH Floor, Key Tower
127 Public Square
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731